

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8-14, 16 and 17 have been amended and, as amended, remain in the application. Claims 2, 3 and 19 were previously cancelled. Claim 15 has now been cancelled. Each of the remaining claims now define a "molded article", as described in original Claim 16.

Independent Claim 1, from which all of the remaining claims depend, has been amended to require that "the functional group (X) and the functional group (Y) are crosslinked". This feature is supported by language at page 47, lines 4-10, of the specification.

Referring to the Office Action and, specifically, the Goetz et al. reference, the Examiner states that "(t)he reference discloses thermosetting coating composition (abstract) containing epoxy functional copolymers and methacrylic block copolymers containing (carboxyl generating) TBMA units". However, the block copolymer of Goetz et al. is a flow control agent (see, for example, its ABSTRACT), which is not reacted with other components which consider its functions. Goetz et al. does not disclose that a block copolymer has a functional group such as an acid anhydride group, a carboxyl group, a hydroxyl group and an epoxy group.

Regarding introduction of carboxyl group into an acrylic block copolymer, in the specification of the instant application, it is described that a direct introduction by polymerization and introduction of the carboxyl group by converting a functional group (see page 17, lines 20 to 26). Goetz et al. does not disclose any introduction method of carboxyl group into the block copolymer such as that a carboxyl group is introduced into the block copolymer by converting a functional group. Thus, even if TBMA is used as a monomer for the acrylic block copolymer of Goetz et al. (see Examples), the block copolymer of Goetz et al. is inherently different from an acrylic block copolymer (A) of the present invention in that there is a no carboxyl group and that it does not react with GMA functional acrylic resin.

It will thus be seen that the claimed invention would not be anticipated by Goetz et al. Accordingly, the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Regarding the Tsuji et al. reference, at the paragraphs 277 and 371 of Tsuji et al. (US 2004/0106732 A1) pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action, applicants

submit that there is no description such as the Examiner describes Tsuji et al. does not describe that a functional group of an acrylic block copolymer and a functional group of a polymer having a weight average molecular weight of 50,000 or less are crosslinked. Therefore, the present invention cannot be anticipated by Tsuji et al. Accordingly, the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) should be withdrawn.

Regarding the Kakeda et al. (WO 02092696) reference, it is not described that a functional group of an acrylic block copolymer and a functional group of a polymer having a weight average molecular weight of 50,000 or less are crosslinked, and that according to the above crosslinking the molded article having improved melt flowability at molding and being excellent in heat resistance is obtained. Thus, the present invention is not anticipated by Kakeda et al. (WO 02092696) and the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding the Kaneda et al. (JP 200260449) reference, molecular weight of 30,000 to 500,000 is not described at paragraphs 12 and 13, but is described in Claim 12 of Kaneda et al. (JP 200260449). However, the molecular weight described in Claim 12 relates to an acrylic block copolymer corresponding to the acrylic block copolymer (A) of the present invention. Thus, the technical feature “the compound (B) is a polymer having a weight average molecular weight of 50,000 or less” is not disclosed in Kaneda et al. (JP 200260449). In addition, it is not described in Kaneda et al. that a functional group of an acrylic block copolymer and a functional group of a polymer having a weight average molecular weight of 50,000 or less are crosslinked. Thus, the present invention is not anticipated by Kaneda et al. (JP 200260449) and the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

App. No. 10/587,496
Client/Matter No. 5404/166

As discussed in the foregoing paragraphs, each of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections fails to support anticipation. Accordingly, applicants request allowance of the remaining claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 4, 2009

/Richard G. Lione/

Richard G. Lione
Reg. No. 19,795
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200